

1. Access. I understand the protective, push-back from the adjoining residents and that is not without a reasonable basis. Princess is a private street that has been, nonetheless dedicated to public use. Additionally, the Development Parcel/s (DP) has a right to reasonable access, although not specifically from any particular location. Unfortunately the less intrusive point of access from German across a new bridge is not feasible, both physically and economically. The only other reasonable access is from the area off Princess. Any development will, most likely, require Princess access. Thus it is not a question of whether to allow access, but how and under what standards and protections.
2. Traffic and Street maintenance: Mitigating the increased traffic, wear and tear and loads during construction would be done by requiring a new development to be included in the CID and pay a proportional share of the maintenance. The developer should also be required to a) only use Princess and not the adjoining streets for access, b) provide for all construction loading and parking on site with appropriate wash-offs and daily policing and cleaning of the streets, with absolutely no parking on or blocking of Princess, c) repair and repave Princess upon completion of construction and keep Princess repaired during construction if necessary; d) provide appropriate land-disturbance storm water run-off protection and monitoring.
3. Use: Although currently zoned commercial, residential use appears to be the most appropriate and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan (comp plan). The use of Planned zoning v. R2 or R3 would give the city substantially more control over architectural, landscaping, flow, appearance, quality of the finished development and other relevant details of the development. A proposed commercial use would result in the least control and planning oversight. The city could not ultimately deny a commercial use that otherwise meets use, zoning and construction requirements. Some of the key issues from the comp plan concerning development of these parcels:

Character of Housing. The size and density of proposed plan are consistent with the surrounding west end homes. The proposed use is an appropriate buffer and transition from the west end commercial to the R1 to the south and west.

Housing options. The smaller villa or townhomes proposed are within the types of housing desired under the comp plan. The architectural finishes should be analyzed and perhaps upgraded somewhat to be consistent with the styles and finishes appropriate for the city, for example the use of siding and the amount of siding. Comp plan: "... Villa developments should be particularly sensitive to the quality of the architecture and landscaping." (p. 32) Would recommend stone and masonry be brought around the sides and restrict siding to more durable type such as hardy board.

Maximize green space. The plan does a good job of providing appropriate and well-designed green space, a benefit of the use of PDR in overall design.

4. Density: This is my biggest conundrum. The comp plan provides for up to 6 units per/acre on a PDR overlay in a commercial and R2 area (p. 32). Petitioner presented their proposed development in reliance on the comp plan. The property is currently platted similar to the rest of the west end and could be developed as r2, although I am unsure how many lots would not be buildable because they would not meet current zoning performance standards. However the proposed development is consistent in density with the adjoining homes. The use of R2 would require each individual lot to meet stormwater quality and quantity requirements, but each lot might be able to do so

with small 'rain gardens.' Not sure if Alderman Guest's argument that only 3.91 acres are developable and thus final density would be governed by that smaller acreage, is the appropriate standard to use. Neither the comp plan nor the city zoning ordinances provide for a calculation of density based on anything other than total land area of the project.

5. Traffic and trips generated. Obviously the amount of traffic on Princess is directly related to the final density and use of any approved development. I am not sure if the traffic study's assumptions concerning trips is substantially out of line, and I would defer to the results as I know no reason not to rely on them. Even assuming some more conservative, greater number of trips, I do not see the new proposed development causing a material decrease in the service level of the intersection at Princess. I would also suggest that the city look at whether changing some of the streets to a 'one-way' or prohibiting certain turns at peak times, or parking might help, but it's worth considering if the use of capitol, golddust or Dwyer changes materially from that anticipated.
6. Number of attached units. Petitioner has changed to mostly 2-attached and a few single units. These are within the guidelines of the comp plan.
7. Size and style of homes: I am not as opposed to the 'urban' look as others, but have a stronger passion for the quality of construction and materials, whatever the style. No vinyl siding with some masonry on the sides.... Perhaps up to 50% on each side. Not sure there really is a "Frontenac" look and not sure we want that. I do like diversity in style and design.
8. Stormwater: there is little doubt the proposed development would improve (i.e. slow down) the rate of runoff and lower the level of flooding on Deer Creek, resulting from the applicant's proposal to remove the existing old steel bridge, which should be a requirement of any approval. This is a huge plus in the analysis.
9. Character of the existing neighborhood. Because I believe Princess is the only reasonable point of access for any new development on the property, the concern that a new development would affect or harm the character and use of the existing neighborhood, although understandable, is not a basis upon which we can or should deny a development. I personally do not see that this proposed development would substantially change the existing character but would, instead, probably enhance it. This concern is, in my mind, a result of the common fear of change we all have.... And I can relate.